

United States Patent and Trademark Office





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/003,742	1	1/14/2001	Mike Dennis	OAE 303 2280		OAE 303
23581	7590	03/26/2003				
KOLISCH		•		EXAMINER		
520 S.W. YA SUITE 200			LINDSEY, RODNEY M			
PORTLANI	O, OR 972	204			PAPER NUMBER	
				3765		
				DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003	DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	/ [
	10/003,742	DENNIS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
·	Rodney M. Lindsey	3765	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	<u> </u>		
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	— · is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		rs prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application).		
4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-16 is/are withdrawn	from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2001 is/ar		·	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- , ,	, ,	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		approved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	-		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	armier.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		40() () ()	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •		
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	•).
a) The translation of the foreign language pro			
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti			
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 	5) Notice of Info	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/003,742

Art Unit: 3765

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-5, drawn to a multilayer helmet shell, classified in class 2, subclass 411.
 - II. Claims 6-16, drawn to a method of making a multiplayer helmet shell, classified in class 264, subclass 259.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as spraying both sides of a sheet-like central layer to define inner and outer layers then pressing the joined layers to define a helmet shell.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Jon M. Dickinson on March 19, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-5. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 6-16 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/003,742

Art Unit: 3765

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemelson.

 Product-by-process claim 1 although reciting structure in terms of how it is made is still a product claim, and it is the patentability of the product which must be determined. Lemelson shows a helmet shell comprising a central layer 16 enclosed by helmet shaped outer and inner layers 12,13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson in view of Dennis et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,742 Page 4

Art Unit: 3765

Lemelson does not teach the foam material as claimed. Dennis et al. teaches old the use of a soft, pliable, microcellular, acceleration-rate-sensitive viscoelastic foam material for a core 16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the foam material of Dennis et al. for the central layer of Lemelson to achieve the advantage of better spreading a shock load borne by the shell as taught by Dennis et al. (see column 3, lines 15-18).

10. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson in view of Dennis et al. as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Daly.

Lemelson does not teach suffusing of the inner and outer layers to the central layer. Daly teaches that it is old to so join or adhere layers to a central layer (see column 3, line13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to fuse the inner, outer and central layers of Lemelson in the manner of Daly to achieve the advantage of forming the layers into a unit.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note particularly, the layered arrangements of Durr, Frieder et al., Ewing et al., Gonzalez et al., Wyckoff, Mead, Chiarella, Morton, Bassette et al., Bell et al. and Pryale and the alternative methods of Nakade et al. and Kopplin.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney M. Lindsey whose telephone number is (703) 305-7818. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

Application/Control Number: 10/003,742

Art Unit: 3765

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John J. Calvert can be reached on (703) 305-1025. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 872-9301.

Rodney M. Lindsey Primary Examiner Art Unit 3765

rml March 20, 2003 Page 5